

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,900	03/22/2004	Dirk Fischer	LA-7004-101C1/10404534	2399
167	7590 06/09/2006		EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI LLP			ZIRKER, DANIEL R	
	/ER STREET, 41ST FLO LES,  CA    90071	OOR .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1771	

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>U</i>
	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
	10/806,900	FISCHER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Daniel Zirker	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	n appears n the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL!  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica!  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC y statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communicati BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
3) Since this application is in condition for a	This action is non-final.	•	is
closed in accordance with the practice u	nder <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-10,12-21 and 31-34 is/are rejection are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Extended The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the first the oath or declaration is objected to by the second Theorem Theorem 11).	accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received.  uments have been received in a e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No. <u>09/530,809</u> . In received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/9-2)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/806,900 Page 2

Art Unit: 1771

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-10, 12-21,31-34 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,817,630. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the '630 patent only has method claims applicants' article claims (as well, of course, the method claims) are seen to closely mirror the claimed method of the patent. As to the method claims themselves such slightly differing limitations in applicants' claim 1 as a 'thermoplastic polymer adhesive" and the fact that the applied adhesive is "in direct contact with each covering layer and the respective printed side of the card core" are believed to be at the very least within the skill of the art in view of the slightly broader language found in the '630

Application/Control Number: 10/806,900 Page 3

Art Unit: 1771

patent's corresponding language found, e.g. in claim 1 in steps d) and e). Finally, with respect to the dependent claims such elements as the specific additives and amounts thereof, the various thicknesses of certain layers and the various lamination temperature of either the process (claim 33) or the article formed thereby (claim 34) are each believed to be at most obvious modifications to one of ordinary skill.

4. In claim 6, line 6, delete "a".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Zirker whose telephone number is 571-272-1486. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on 571 - 272 - 1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1771

Daniel Zirker Primary Examiner Art Unit 1771

Daniel Zuker